## REMARKS

As amended, claim 1 calls for substantially crystalline, non-switching ovonic material and a phase change material coupled to the non-switching ovonic material, said phase change material changing between more and less conductive states.

Claim 1, before amendment, was rejected over Parkinson under Section 102. However, Parkinson's non-switching ovonic threshold switch maintains a substantially amorphous state. See paragraph 35, line 6.

Claim 1, before amendment, was also rejected over Lowrey. Likewise, Lowrey's select device is made of an ovonic threshold switch which maintains a substantially amorphous state. See paragraph 33, line 6.

Finally, claim 1, before amendment, was rejected over Gilton. However, Gilton does not teach using two different types of chalcogenide material, including one which is non-switching. Gilton explains that all three layers recited in the office action are a metal doped chalcogenide. He specifically mentions that the composition of the layers 208 and 204 may be the same, but this is not necessarily so. The composition of the layer 425 is merely described as metal doped chalcogenide. Nothing suggests that it is in any way different than the layers 204 or 208. Thus, it appears that Gilton teaches three layers that are all the same material. Certainly, he does not teach making one of the layers non-switching and one of the layers switched between conductive and less conductive states. Moreover, he does not teach making the non-switching material substantially crystalline.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 6, 2006

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]
Attorneys for Intel Corporation